

### Remarks

Entry of the amendments, reconsideration of the application, as amended, and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested. Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-25 and 27-31 remain pending.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowability of claims 8-9, 18-19 and 29-30, if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. By the amendment above, applicants have rewritten those claims in independent form, and thus, respectfully request an indication of allowance for those claims.

Moreover, applicants have amended the originally filed independent claims to include another aspect of applicants' invention. In particular, applicants have amended the independent claims to include a revised feature of dependent claim 5, and similar dependent claims. Support for this amendment can be found in the original claims, as well as within the specification (e.g., page 32, lines 15-19; page 32, lines 26-28 and pages 33-34, lines 1-9). Thus, no new matter is added.

In the Office Action dated March 10, 2003, claims 1-4, 11-14 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ellsworth et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,344). Additionally, claims 5-7, 10, 15-17, 20, 26-28 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellsworth in view of George et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,786). Applicants respectfully, but most strenuously, traverse these rejections for the reasons below.

One aspect of applicants' invention is directed to managing logical processors of a computing environment. For example, the number of logical processors that are to be configured to a logical partition are automatically determined based on workload (see, e.g., pp. 30-34 of applicants' Specification). In one example, the automatically determining uses an equation to determine whether the configuration is to be adjusted and this equation is based on workload of the logical partition (see, e.g., p. 32, lines 15-19, 26-29; and p. 33, lines 1-22).

In one particular example (e.g., independent claim 1), a method of managing logical processors of a computing environment is provided. The method includes, for instance, configuring a logical partition of the computing environment with one or more logical

processors; automatically determining based on workload of the logical partition that the configuration is to be adjusted; and dynamically adjusting the configuration. Thus, in applicants' claimed invention, the determination of whether the logical partition is to be dynamically adjusted is automatic and is based on workload of the partition. This is very different from the teachings of Ellsworth and George, either alone or in combination.

For example, Ellsworth fails to teach or suggest automatically determining based on workload of the logical partition that the configuration is to be adjusted. This deficiency of Ellsworth is recognized in the Office Action, which states: "[E]llsworth does not specifically show... determining that said configuration is to be adjusted." Thus, the Office Action relies on George for this feature. However, applicants respectfully submit that George also fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of applicants' claimed invention.

For example, George fails to teach or suggest taking into consideration workload of the logical partition in determining that the configuration of the logical partition is to be adjusted. Instead, George relies on a set of rules stated in a policy. It is explicitly stated throughout George that any configuration changes to be made are based on the policy. For example, in col. 2, lines 56-60, it is stated, "Similarly, the present invention supports the process of dynamic merging, which includes adding resources to logical partitions, and activating additional logical partitions based on the policy." Further, in col. 4, lines 53-55, it states "[P]olicy 106 determines that a configuration change is necessary." This policy includes a set of explicit rules that dictate what is to happen. However, these rules do not include workload of the logical partition (see, e.g., col. 6, lines 6-17). Applicants respectfully submit that there is no discussion in George of the automatically determining taking into consideration the workload of a logical partition in deciding whether to dynamically adjust the configuration. There is no description in George of, for example, an equation that takes into consideration the percentage of CPC capacity assigned to a logical partition, percentage of CPC capacity currently being used by the partition, etc. This is missing from George, and therefore, George does not teach or suggest this aspect of applicants' claimed invention.

In support of the rejection, the Office Action specifies col. 4, lines 51-59 of George. However, a careful reading of that section further supports applicants' contention that it is a

policy that is used in the determining and not workload of the logical partition. Again, there is no teaching or suggestion of using workload of the logical partition to automatically determine that the configuration is to be adjusted. Thus, George does not teach or suggest applicants' claimed invention.

Since both Ellsworth and George fail to teach or suggest at least applicants' claimed element of automatically determining based on workload of the logical partition that said configuration is to be adjusted, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as well as the other independent claims, are patentable over the combination of Ellsworth and George. Further, the dependent claims are patentable for the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as for their own additional features. Thus, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for all pending claims.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case with applicants' attorney, please contact the undersigned at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Blanche E. Schiller  
Blanche E. Schiller  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 35,670

Dated: July 10, 2003.

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.  
5 Columbia Circle  
Albany, New York 12203-5160  
Telephone: (518) 452-5600  
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579